

REMARKS

The Office Action dated February 12, 2008, has been received and reviewed. This response, submitted along with a Petition for a Three-Month Extension of Time, is directed to that action.

Claims 1, 3 and 11 have been amended, claims 17 and 18 are new, and claim 2 has been cancelled. Support for the claim amendments and new claims 17 and 18 can be found in claim 2 as originally filed and in paragraphs [0074] and [0075] of the corresponding US published application, 2006/0057366 A1. No new matter has been added.

The applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Information Disclosure Statement

The Examiner noted that the Information Disclosure Statement filed May 3, 2005 fails to comply with 37 CFR §1.98(a) because copies of the documents EP 0728165 and EP 0729494 were not provided. The applicants note that the only published equivalents for these documents are the International Applications WO 95/13327 and WO 95/13328, respectively. Both of these documents have been provided by the applicant to the USPTO. It is respectfully requested that these references be considered, if they have not already been.

Claim Rejections- 35 U.S.C. §102

The Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Chao (US Statutory Invention Registration H0,000,509). The applicants respectfully submit that the amendments to claim 1 herein render this rejection moot, and respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

The Examiner additionally rejected claim 1 as anticipated by Buccellato et al. (WO 98/24978; US 6,861,141 B2 to Buccellato et al. being relied upon as an equivalent document for convenience). Again, the applicants submit that the amendments to claim 1 herein render this rejection moot, and respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Bennett et al. (US 5,602,221). The applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The presently claimed invention now relates to a pressure sensitive adhesive which further comprises thermal crosslinking agents. Bennett '221 only teaches substituted triazines and multifunctional alkyl acrylate crosslinking agents. (See col. 4, lines 22-32). The crosslinking agents taught in Bennett react in the presence of high energy radiation such as electron beam and UV, while thermal crosslinking agents according to the present invention react in the presence of heat. Bennett '221, therefore, does not teach all of the limitations of the presently claimed invention, and a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 cannot be established. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

The Examiner also rejected claims 1-9, 11, 12 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Bennett et al. (WO 95/13328). The applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Like Bennett '221, Bennett '328 also fails to teach thermal crosslinking agents according to the presently claimed invention. Rather, Bennett '328 only teaches multifunctional acrylate crosslinking agents (see page 10, lines 1-3), which, as previously described, are much different than thermal crosslinking agents. Therefore, the applicants submit that Bennett '328 fails to teach all of the limitations of the presently claimed invention, and respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections- 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner rejected claims 7, 8, 10 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Bennett '328; and claims 13-15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Bennett '328 in view of Buccellato. The applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

As previously discussed, the presently claimed invention includes thermal crosslinking agents, which are not taught or suggested in Bennett '328. Moreover, the applicants submit that the presently claimed invention exhibits surprising and unexpected results over comparative adhesives outside of the present claims, because the present invention achieves a virtually constant bond strength over a wide peel-rate range. Contrarily, the comparative adhesives result in a reduction in the constancy in bond strength as a function of peel rate. Specifically, bond strength of the comparative adhesives increases as peel rate increases. (See Tables 1 and 2, paragraphs [0105] to [0110] of US 20006/0057366). The constant bond strength over a range of peel rates provides the advantages in bonding reversibly to a variety of substrates.

Accordingly, because the present invention exhibits surprising and unexpected results, a *prima facie* case of obviousness is rebutted, and the applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn.

Applicants believe that the claims are in condition for allowance, and such favorable action is respectfully requested. If any issues remain, the resolution of which may be advanced through a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicants' attorney at the phone number listed below.


CONDITIONAL PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME

If any extension of time for this response is required, Applicants request that this be considered a petition therefore. Please charge the required fee to Deposit Account No. 14-1263.

ADDITIONAL FEES

Please charge any further insufficiency of fees, or credit any excess to Deposit Account No. 14-1263

Respectfully submitted,
NORRIS McLAUGHLIN & MARCUS, P.A.

By 
Mark D. Marin
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 50,842
875 Third Avenue - 18th Floor
New York, New York 10022
Phone: (212) 808-0700
Fax: (212) 808-0844